



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,078	04/07/2000	Stephane H Maes	Y0999-273(8728-298)	1114

7590 02/11/2004

Frank Chau Esq  
F Chau & Associates L L P  
1900 Hempstead Turnpike Suite 501  
East Meadow, NY 11554

EXAMINER
----------

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/545,078

Applicant(s)

MAES, STEPHANE H

Examiner

B. Prieto

Art Unit

2142

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-25 and 27-38.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Supplemental Advisory*

1. This communication is in response to after-final amendment mailed 1/23/04, claims 1-38 remain pending.

2. Applicant argues in regards to claims 1, 23 and 34, that the Saylor reference does not teach claim limitation as recited, because the Saylor reference only teaches a mono-modal dialog via a voice browser and only provides voice content.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, it is noted that according to applicant's specification, a multi-modal dialog (i.e. information exchange) between user and a machine of varying I/O capabilities, wherein a multi-modal dialog comprises modalities such as speech only (e.g. VoiceXML), visual-only (GUI) (e.g. HTML), restricted GUI, etc. (see page 10, lines 18 to page 11, line 14). The Saylor teaches a multi-modal dialog system (col 1/line 55-col 2/lines 64). Given the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim term "I/O modalities" as mandated (see MPEP §2111) in light of the specification, arguments that the Saylor reference only teaches a mono-modal dialog via a voice browser and only provides voice content and therefore does not teach claim limitation are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues in regards to claims 1, 23 and 24, that the Huna reference is unrelated to the claimed invention.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, it is noted that according to applicant's disclosure the invention relates generally to systems and methods for accessing information over a communication network using a portal and a browser (see page 1, lines 5-9), wherein a portals are gateways or web sites that provide access to web content (see page 3, lines 10-21). The Huna references teaches accessing information over a communication network using web sites (portal) and a browser (col 1/lines 8-col 2/line 37). Arguments that the Huna reference is unrelated to the claimed invention are not persuasive.

4. Amendment after-final filed 1/23/04 will be entered upon appeal brief.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0750. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Jack B. Harvey can be reached on (703) 305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to the Central Fax Office:


(703) 872-9306, for Official communications and entry;

Or Telephone:

(703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist), further ensuring that a receipt is provided stamped "TC 2100".

  
B. Prieto  
TC 2100  
Patent Examiner  
February 9, 2004

  
JACK B. HARVEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER